

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-26 are pending in this application.

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite and for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-2, 5-7, 18-21, and 23-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Santandrea et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,316,228 (Hereinafter "Santandrea").

Claims 8-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Santandrea in view of Luciani, U.S. Patent No. 4,982,908 (Hereinafter "Luciani").

Claims 3, 4, and 22 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in suitable independent form.

Summary of Applicant's Reply

Applicant notes with appreciation the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 3, 4, and 22. Applicant expressly reserves the right to rewrite claims 3, 4, and 22 in independent form should the base claim ultimately not be allowed.

Applicant has proposed amending claims 1 and 20 to further clarify the claims. No new matter would be added by these amendments.

The Examiner's objections and rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicant's Reply to the
Indefiniteness Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In particular, the Examiner rejected claim 1 as being indefinite and vague for having the phrase "said distal portion facing away from said axis of rotation." The Examiner questioned the meaning of "distal portion facing away" and the identification of the "axis of rotation".

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is not indefinite or vague. The Examiner's attention is directed to applicant's FIG. 2, which may illustrates, inter alia, the features of applicant's claim 1. Transfer device 12 has two arm portions 12c and 12d (i.e., support members) that are joined to shaft 14, which rotates around axis AX2 (i.e., the axis of rotation). The distal portion of arm portion 12c faces obliquely away from axis AX2 (i.e., the distal portion of arm portion 12c faces a direction perpendicular to axis AX1) (Applicant's Specification, page 16, line 4, through page 17, line 10).

Accordingly, it can be seen that FIG. 2 clearly demonstrates an exemplary configuration in which a distal portion of the support member faces obliquely away from the axis of rotation. Thus, applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is not indefinite, and respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

Applicant's Reply to the
Prior Art Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 5-7, 18-21, and 23-26 under 35 U.S.C § 102(b) as being anticipated by Santandrea. The Examiner also rejected claims 8-17 under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Santandrea in view of Luciani. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Amended independent claims 1 and 20 are directed, respectively, toward a wire-winding machine and a method for winding wire coils on a machine component using a winding machine. The winding machine has at least one support member configured to rotate about an axis of rotation to transfer a machine component between at least two assembly stations. A detachable machine housing component projects from a distal portion of the support member that faces obliquely away from the axis of rotation.

In Santandrea machine housing components 21 are pivotably mounted to support members 31. The distal portions of support members 31 face perpendicularly away from the axis of rotation. Housing components 21 pivot between a first orientation that is parallel to the axis of rotation and a second orientation that is perpendicular to the axis of rotation (Santandrea, FIG. 5 and col. 2, line 39 through col. 3, line 15). Thus, Santandrea does not show a support member having a distal portion facing obliquely away from the axis of rotation and a housing that projects from the distal portion obliquely away from the axis of rotation, as required by applicant's amended independent claims 1 and 20.

Accordingly, for at least this reason, applicant's amended independent claims 1 and 20 are allowable over Santandrea.

For at least the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claims 1 and 20, dependent claims 2, 5-19, 21, and 23-26, which depend from independent claim 1 and 20, are also allowable.

Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of claims 1, 2, 5-21, and 23-26 be withdrawn.

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, prompt reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Chasan
Registration No. 54,026
Agent for Applicant
FISH & NEAVE IP GROUP
ROPES & GRAY LLP
Customer No. 1473
1251 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10020-1105
(212) 596-9000